

808. f 23
2

A SECOND
LETTER

TO THE
Lord Bishop of *Carlisle*,

Lord Almoner to His Majesty,

Upon the Subject of
Bishop *M E R K S*;

By Occasion of seizing some

LIBELS,

PARTICULARLY

A Collection of Papers

Written by the Late

R. Reverend *George Hickes*, D.D.

THE SECOND EDITION.



L O N D O N :

Printed by *Sam. Buckley*, in *Amen-Corner*. 1716.
Price Six Pence.

1940

106-118

1910

[illegible]

By Google

2017

100-100000

Collected by

1943 515 20 10 17

R. R. R. R.



A Second

LETTER

TO THE

Lord Bishop of Carlisle, &c.

My LORD,

IN the Course of a long and useful Correspondence with your Lordship, I took the Liberty (in dubious Times) of writing one Letter in Defence of the Protestant Succession, upon Occasion of a great Book or sort of large Declaration of the Pretender's Right, then publish'd with some Pomp and Appearance of Authority. What I wrote had the Favour of your Lordship's Approbation, for the sake of the Argument and good Meaning of the Writer; it being intended for a just and seasonable Plea, to vindicate our Original *Constitution*, and to secure the *Happy Settlement* we now enjoy. It was therefore communicated to the World under this Title, *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, concerning one of his Predecessors Bishop Merks, on Occasion of a new Volume for the Pretender, intituled, The Hereditary Right*

of the Crown of England Asserted. Printed for Sam. Buckley, and dated Octob. 28, 1713. wherein I confess, " That the Gentleman, the Author of that " Volume, had indeed exprest himself with the Air " of a Courtier, and all the Appearance of a " Scholar: But the Subject Matter was only to arraign the Nation of Treason and Rebellion, and " his late Majesty King *William* of Usurpation; " nay, and to absolve the Queen then reigning, " upon no other Terms, than a good Intention " to resign the Crown to one called a Right " Heir. " He was full of Citations and References to this Purpose: But notwithstanding his Advantages of free Access to the *Tower*, &c. I did say, " That no Labourer for a Party was ever " guilty of more Mistakes, or had given more " wrong Turns to the Matters of Fact and " Law.

Having no Leisure to go through the Book, I offered at one single Instance, as more immediately relating to your Lordship and your See of *Carlisle*, the Case of Bishop *Merks*, who having been adjudg'd to Death for Rebelling against *Henry IV.* when legally establish'd on the Throne, and for Attempting to restore King *Richard II.* after his Abdication, and being thereupon deprived of his Bishoprick, was highly applauded by that Author, or rather the Authors of that Volume, as a noble *Speaker* and *Sufferer* for the Cause of *Hereditary Right*; a glorious Example of *Fidelity* and *Fortitude*; and all the fine Words which the Papists us'd to bestow upon a *Traitour* when they made him a *Martyr*.

Your Lordship was best able to judge, whether I did not sufficiently prove, that whatever was said of Bishop *Merks* on that Occasion, was a feigned Story, as to his *Speech*; and as to his Sufferings, the whole was mistaken in Time, and Place, and Manner, and other Circumstances of them. So that

that if by that single Instance we might judge of the rest of that Performance, the *Gentleman* and his Assistants were not very modest, or rather the Subject would not bear Truth and Honesty.

I remember under those Dangers of the Church I had the Courage to conclude, " I pray, my Lord, let us not be run down by a noisy Faction in their open Defiance to the Queen's Hereditary Right, and to that of Her Protestant Successors, as limited by Law. It is a special Providence, that by taking the most solemn Oaths our Consciences depend upon it; nay, our Establish'd Church, the Protestant Interest of *Europe*, our Civil Rights and Liberties, the Well-Being of our Posterity, every thing that can be dear to a good Christian and an honest *Briton*. Our own Reason, our own Conscience can never fail us: If we seek our own Ruin, it must be a Judicial Infatuation upon us.

I now gratulate your Lordship, that by God's Blessing we are escaped that *Judicial Infatuation*, when it spread more than can be well imagined upon the deluded Minds of the People. I have often thank'd your Lordship for that noble Share you had in prescribing against the General Infection, by your constant Advices to your Clergy, by your kind Influences on the Nobility and Gentry, and at last by taking the Field with them against the Rebels, as many of our brave Northern Prelates had done against the Incurſion of the *Scots*, and Insurrection of Rebels, in *Times of Yore*.

One Motive of my Writing to your Lordship on that Juncture of contending for *Hereditary Right*, was not so fit to be then mentioned: It was, that I had some more than ordinary Indignation at the hearing from an Eye-Witness, that one of the first Presents of that Volume of *Hereditary Right*, splendidly bound, was made to Her Majesty's own Person

Person at *Windsor*, by the very Gentleman who was supposed to have the greatest Hand in it; a Gentleman who had not taken the Oaths to Her, and who at that Time would not have gone to the Chapel with Her, and by Principle could never pray for Her. And yet this Gentleman, upon and after the Publication of that Book, had frequent Accesses to the Royal Closet, and by his own Application and Interest, obtain'd a hasty Discharge of great part of the Penalty inflicted by Law on a Non-juring Divine, for transmitting those Papers to the Press, and correcting the Sheets, and being found guilty of the Printing and Publishing of them.

I soon saw the Effects of my Writing to your Lordship upon that Argument, against the Wind and Tide that were then rising upon the Nation. I had with humble Expectation a plentiful Return of ill Language and ill Usage for it, which I valued not, as knowing our Cause to be good in itself, and by me honestly maintain'd. I was threatened with a terrible Answer, and I know the Man who really took great Pains in searching over Histories and Records, to defend the Loyal Character of Bishop *Merk*s from that Account of Rebel and Submitter that I had given of him: But I am sure the Evidence would not serve, and so I heard no more of it.

But it seems, my Lord, in a late Search for the Person and Papers of Mr. *Laurence Howel*, ordained a Priest by Dr. *George Hickes*, who bore the Title of a Suffragan Bishop of *Thetford*, among other notable Discoveries, there was one Sheet superscribed, *A Letter to Dr. Wh. Kennet*: Beginning, Sir, Your usual Heat and ill Manners you must expect will draw upon you the Pens of honest Men, so long as you continue them; and concluding, To avoid your Malice and the Censure of the Administration, I shall use such Caution, as to give you no Opportunity of making any Innuendo;

endo; for I shall confine my self to the Year 1688. and I promise my self this Satisfaction, that you must either consent with me, or deny the Laws of God and Man, and make all Records and Histories incredible, as if they were your own Penning. I am your faithful Monitor, A. B.

So, as it seems, this Letter was to be an insulting Dedication of a Book to me: For at the bottom there runs in the same Hand, *The following Pages are an Answer to the Brief History of the Crown of England, written at the Time when the Bill of Exclusion was attempted against the Queen's Father, then Duke of York.* Yet the Papers containing that Answer do not follow, but another Postscript, (crossed out with a Pen) I give you Leave to read over the Remarks I have sent you upon Mr. Steel's Crisis, which Book of his I advise you to read with Caution, &c. Those Remarks are likewise wanting, but there is another prefatory Epistle directed to 'Squire Steel, and beginning in a very haughty foolish Way, Your Motto, 'Squire, is ill apply'd, for you pretend to be unwilling to do Mischief, which you are most naturally fond of; Parturiunt montes, &c. had been more proper, — &c.

By this Taste of the Stile and Temper of the two Letters to Mr. Steel and me, your Lordship may infer, that we were great Offenders against their Creature the Pretender, and the Notions that were to set him up; and therefore highly deserved their severest Rebuke and Chastisement of us. And yet they did it (so far at least as in those Epistles, the other Papers I saw not) in an impotent Way of railing and ridiculing; to which I could not have replied, had their intended Works come out at a Time when they were prepar'd, the latter End of the Queen's Reign.

In the Letter to me, (an original Paper signed by the Messengers that seized it,) there is no entering upon the Cause in History or Law; but only terrible

rible Objurgations, *that my Heterodox Preaching and Practise had drawn away many People from the Truth of Religious Worship in the Church*: By which I hope the Writer understands, as I do, that I have kept some good People from running into their rebellious Schism, wherein they pretend to the only *Truth of Religious Worship*. He complains grievously, *that I give a vile Character of Bishop Merks, and yet, against my Will, I make him strictly faithful to his Rightful Sovereign, &c.* But I say, my Lord, not a Word of other Answer to the Authorities I had given for his being a Tool in the Hands of an ill Ministry, and a weak Prince; that for Ambition and Court-Attendance he was drawn in too far to Retreat; that upon the Accession of King Henry IV. this made him first a Malecontent, then a busie Man, and, by Degrees, a Conspirator, a Traitour, by Law convicted, by the Pope deprived, by the King pardoned. I might add, that this glorious Confessor and Sufferer (as they represent him) for *Hereditary Right*, did not only sue, in submissive Manner, for the Mercy of that Prince whom he had called an *Usurper*; but, upon better Thoughts, must needs take the Oath of Fidelity to him: For he was afterwards protected, favoured, and even preferred by him.

All which Particulars, not observed by the Authors of *Hereditary Right*, nor enquired after by this Letter-Writer, do certainly make the Circumstances and Character of Bishop Merks intirely different from what they have drawn for him, to dress him up a Champion for their *indefeasible Right of Inheritance*.

Not a Bishop so made for the Merits of Piety and Learning, but a forward Monk, thrust up by King Richard, in the worst Scene of his Administration, the xxi. of his Reign. Not coming in by *Canonical Election*, but imposed upon the Prior and Monks by a *Dispensing Power* of the King and Pope.

Pope. Not the Man of Honour, and for his Country's Good, but a Creature of the *new Created Lords*, who at that Time of their Promotion were betraying the Kingdom, and ruining the King. Not afterwards the *Man of Conscience and Integrity*, as they forsooth call him; but so far engaged in that abandon'd Party, that he could not timely leave it, having been a Companion of King Richard into *Ireland*, and one of the Executors of his last Will. Upon the Accession of Henry IV. not a Patriot, or a Speech-Maker, as they have invented, but either absent from that Parliament, or at least a silent Spectator in it, as the Nonjuring Bishops in the Convention 1688-9. Not afterwards a Prelate at *Prayers and Tears*, but actually plotting and rising in Arms to murder the King, and bring about a *French Invasion*. At his Trial for High Treason, not a Pleader of *Loyalty* to King Richard, or of *Usurpation* in King Henry; but he insisted only upon the Privileges of Exemption of a Popish Pontiff, that being an *Anointed Bishop* he was not obliged to answer before the Secular Judges. Nor would he stand to suffer for that Plea, but when it was over-ruled, he submitted to plead *Not Guilty*, and put himself upon his Country, who inquiring upon their Oaths brought him in Guilty. When remanded to the *Tower*, he shewed no Inclination to be a Sufferer, and a *glorious Example of Fortitude*, as they extol him; but he cast himself upon the Mercy of his injured Sovereign, and obtained a gracious Pardon, which he pleaded in open Court, and entered in to due *Recognizance*, with sufficient *Sureties* for his good Behaviour. And, after all, a quiet and obedient Subject to King Henry IV. and though a Deprived Bishop, yet the King's Clerk of the King's Patronage in another Ecclesiastical Benefice or two, which he enjoyed, for ought we know, to his Life's End.

To our Searchers after the Truth of Ancient Matters of Fact and Characters of Men, it is some Provocation to hear the Leaders of a Party against a settled Government magnified and set up in high Figures, beyond all Manner of Proportion and Likeness. Upon this false Bottom the few Enemies of our Happy Revolution will be set forth as Patriots and Confessors; and the Assassins of King *William*, and the Rebels against King *George*, will be in the Rank of Confessors and Martyrs. This was always one of the splendid Frauds in the Church of *Rome*, and by their Artifices too much of late prevailing, has been made very much the Humour of our Common People. Not to mention Dying Speeches, and Funeral Rites, and other idle Stories: Some of our Pulpits have been said to ring of the *Immortal Hickes*; and the Writer of the Letter to me tells me of good Mr. *Lefley*, that I cannot but know the worth of that good and useful Man, that great Ornament of the CHURCH, and Honour of the NATION. And he tells me of another whom I have aspers'd, who is the most accomplished Man living, and Eminent for all Moral Virtues becoming his High Birth; meaning, I suppose, Mr. *Nelson*, whom I never aspers'd, though I was a Stranger to his High-Birth. What Diptychs shall we have at last in their Church? What a Catalogue of Saints and Martyrs?

This advancing of their Church-Men for being Contenders and Champions against the Powers of Sovereign Princes, is the partial Favour of their Church-Historian, Mr. *Collier*, who all along defends the Prelate against the King; not only in the Case of *Anselm*, but of that greater Incendiary *Thomas Becket*, whose extreme Insolence upon the Breach of his Faith to the King and Lords, he says, *Was, it may be, pushing Matters too far*. But then as to any Practice against the Crown, he seems innocent enough: And in short, the most exceptionable Parts

of

of his Conduct, may be said to have been more the Faults of the Age than of the Man. I dare say, my Lord, no one in the World can believe this, but some one who knows no more of *Becket*, than that his Name is in the *Roman Kalendar*. Farther, my Lord, that Ecclesiastical Writer does not only speak smoother Things of *Queen Mary*, the Burner of Hereticks, than he does of our Protestant Queen *Elizabeth*; but he really speaks better of *Gardiner* and *Bonner*, Papal Fox and Butcher, than he does of *Cranmer*, and some other of our glorious Reformers and Martyrs.

Nay, such is the Charity and good Nature, my Lord, of these new Church-Men of the Jacobite Separation, that they will not spare their own dear Brethren, if they offend them, or differ from them any wise in their singular Notions or Practice. I beg Leave to give an Instance or two of this their Brotherly Love from the late *Collection of Papers written by the late R. Reverend George Hickes, D. D. 8vo. 1716.* in the Cases of Mr. *Dodwell*, Bishop *Ken*, and Mr. *Kettlewell*, three Persons who, one would think, did as well deserve the good Word of the whole Fraternity, as any Men whatever; and yet severe and strange Accounts are there given of them, not *candid*, and I believe not true.

Mr. *Dodwell* was the very Man, who upon the Principle of the *Invalidity of Lay Deprivation* was, in effect, the Author and first Vindicator of their Separation from us; and was more able than any one to fetch it out of the broken State of the Primitive Church, and to draw his wonted Chain of Consequences from such confused Authorities. And yet this learned Man, having some Moderation in him, and not being willing the Schism should continue after the decease of the Deprived Bishops, and therefore arguing upon that Case in View, and

afterwards upon the same Case in Fact, and accordingly conforming his own Practise to it, and returning to the Communion of our Church; Dr. Hickes is out of Patience with him: He undertakes to shew the Weakness of Mr. Dodwell's Reasoning in his CASE IN VIEW, by many like Cases and Queries, from p. 237. to p. 242. as weak (says he) as Weakness it self, p. 247. an obscure and fallacious way of Reasoning, p. 252, 258. his Arguments turn upon himself and in his own Words, p. 258. I hope, Sir, (says he to Mr. Nelson) I have said enough to abate the great Deference you have for Mr. Dodwell upon the Account of his great Learning and Piety, and pray you to consider, that if he were freer from Infirmities than he is, and his Authority greater, yet you ought not to follow his Example, when he is not in the Right, and argues so weakly as he has done in his CASE IN VIEW.— Tertullian, tho' a greater Man than Mr. Dodwell, was himself an Instance of humane Frailty; and I pray you to see what VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS saith of him and ORIGEN, tho' a Prodigy of Piety and Learning, and of many more of the greatest among the Antients, who through humane Infirmities fell into great Errors, and caused great Disturbances in the Church. Again and again, I could shew you, that Mr. Dodwell in his CASE IN VIEW is contrary to himself in his former Writings, which he wrote in Defence of our Deprived Fathers. But perhaps that will be done by another Hand. You know also how much he is addicted to Nostrums, and how apt he is to raise Doctrines from single Passages out of one or two Fathers, which were never received, taught, or professed by the Catholick Church. You know also what Offence of late he hath given by his Writings to Learned Church-Men of both Communions; and particularly, what Offence he gave to our Deprived Fathers and their Presbyters, by his PARÆNESIS AD EXTEROS; where upon a new and false Hypothesis of his own making,

making, contrary to the Account's which all antient Writers give of the first Bishops, (I mean his Hypothesis of the JERUSALEM SUPREMACY) he argues in as weak and precarious a Manner from Devolution of Right, as he doth in his Case in View; without telling us by what Provision or Direction of Law Ecclesiastical, the Episcopal Right of the last of the Jerusalem Bishops of our Lord's Family devolved upon the Presbyters, whom he supposed were Presidents or Protocathedrists of all Churches when that Succession ended. Again, there was great want of Law and Logick in Mr. Dodwell, to write in such a weak as well as fallacious Manner, p. 258.

My Lord, I am not going to make an Apology for any of the Singularities of Mr. Dodwell; yet whatever was his Narrowness of Spirit, he had greater Charity than Dr. Hicke; and of all Men the Doctor should have been the last to speak such angry Things of him. If Mr. Dodwell was living when that Letter was written, I believe Mr. Nelson was too tender to shew it him: Yet I cannot but wish it had come to Mr. Dodwell's View, while he had been able to give an Answer to it. We all know, that Mr. Dodwell was not very patient of Contradiction, and that in any Conference upon such kind of Subjects, he would frequently call for the *vicissitudines loquendi*, his Turns of speaking; and when got in, it was not very easy to interrupt him. To do him Justice, he was very sincere in the Belief of himself and his own Notions, and rather than openly retract them, he would have suffer'd any Persecution. A pervicacious Humour, that the wise King William was very sensible of, and would often say to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, that Mr. Dodwell wanted to be in Prison; but, says his Majesty, I shall disappoint him.

But

But Dr. *Hickes*, it seems, had still harder Things to say of Mr. *Dodwell*; for he must mean it of him, when he says, "I take the Freedom to tell you, that he whose great Example you follow in this Case, never would say *Amen* to the Prayers for King *James*; and since his Majesty's Death said to one of our Brethren, who will assure you of the Truth of it, that he thought we ought to pray for the Princess *Anne* as Queen, because she kept out a Popish Successor. It would be no Wonder to see such a Man join the other Assemblies. Now, my Lord, the former Things were peevish and unbrotherly, and I doubt these are very *false*. I had an Opportunity of knowing Mr. *Dodwell* as well as any Man who differed from him; I knew his Manner of Communication in *Oxford* several Years; I lived with him in *St. Edmund Hall* about the Time of the Revolution; and convers'd frequently with him in the Company of the Principal of that House, the learned Dr. *Mills*. And after he was deprived of his *Camden* Professorship, he was my Parishioner at *Shottesbrook* in *Berks*, several Years together; till upon my coming to *Aldermary Church* in *London*, I resigned that other Rectory, not as untenable, but as I was unwilling to keep it. Now in all that long Season of Acquaintance, I could not find out, that *he never would say Amen to the Prayers for King James*; I am sure while he was upon the Throne, Mr. *Dodwell* had the most distinguished Principles of Loyalty to him, and was a most constant Resorter to our publick Prayers, and seemed to join in every Petition and Suffrage of them. I dare say for him, that if he could not have said *Amen* to the Prayers for King *James*, he would have then express'd his Dissent from that Part of the Prayers. For it is well known, while he came to Church after the Revolution,

Revolution, before he had formed his Separation, he would join in all the Prayers, excepting those for King *William* and Queen *Mary*; and when he came to them, he was not content with a silent Suspence, but he sufficiently shewed his open Abhorrence of them. Indeed after King *James* was in *Ireland*, Mr. *Henry Dodwell* had the less Affection for that Royal Person; because, poor Man, he found himself proscribed, and his Estate forfeited, by Popish Interest and Power in that Kingdom. But still his Principles of Regal Right and Passive Submission were the same; and by the profound Respect with which he always mentioned that unhappy Prince, I could never surmise but that he prayed for him, and that in the Daily Offices of the Liturgy among themselves. That since the Death of King *James*, he should be so good as to say to one of his Brethren, that he *thought we ought to pray for the Princess Anne as Queen, because she kept out a Popish Successor* * is to me incredible, tho' I should be extremely glad to have it granted; for I hope it will be an Argument to some of his Admirers to pray for King *George* as King, because he much more effectually keeps out the same Popish Pretender.

The next Person not kindly or justly used by Dr. *Hickes*, is Bishop *Ken*, one of his Deprived Fathers, or in his Sense, of his Colleagues and Brethren. A Man of exemplary Piety and Humility, and at first of great Charity in the Controversies arising upon the Revolution. His Doubtfulness and Fearfulness could not be easily determined.

* Mr. *Brokesby*, the Author of the Life of Mr. *Dodwell*, who was long Chaplain in those private Families of Mr. *Cherry* and Mr. *Dodwell*, does not hint at any of these things; nor Mr. *Hearne*, that I know of.

mined. He own'd in his Letter to the Bishop of
 " Sarum, Octob. 5, 1689. that he had prepared
 " a *Pastoral Letter* upon the Supposition of alter-
 " ing his Judgment, and that there might have
 " been an Inducement to him to comply: " But it seems he burnt his Paper, and adher'd
 to his former Opinion; but still without cen-
 suring others of a contrary Judgment, much less
 dividing in Communion from them. To his old
 Friend Dr. Hooper, now Lord Bishop of Bath
 and Wells, who had daily and earnestly dis-
 cours'd him on the Subject of Compliance
 with the Oath, he at last used these Expressi-
 ons, — I question not, but that you, and several
 others have taken the Oaths with as good a Consci-
 ence as my self shall refuse them; and sometimes you
 have almost perswaded me to comply, by the Arguments
 you have used; but I beg you to urge them no farther;
 for should I be perswaded to comply, and after see Rea-
 son to repent, you would make me the most miserable
 Man in the World. * We have heard, my Lord, of
 many more Signs and Tokens of Reluctancies and
 Suspences of Mind in Bishop Ken, and of Mr.
 Dodwell's Correspondence with him, and turning
 him back in his very way to London, when he
 was going up to submit to the Government. We
 have the greatest Reason to think it was Anxiety
 of Thought, a tremulous Conscience, and the
 Fear of an After-Repentance, that made him
 chuse (as a mortified Man) the safer Side of Pe-
 nalty in Ease and Quiet †. And yet he was then
 somewhat irresolv'd: I believe it will appear, that
 upon the Queen's Accession to the Throne he had
 some Thoughts of submitting, to be re-instated
 in

* A short Account of the Life of Bishop Ken, by W. Hawkins,
 Esq; 1713. 8vo. p. 33.

† Ibid. p. 89.

in his See. And when he could not get over all his Doubts and Scruples, he was again intangled in a new Question of Resigning or not Resigning. In short, my Lord, he was not a Man after the Heart of Dr. *Hickes*, and therefore is untowardly used by him. I doubt the Bishop did not approve of the Doctor's Consecration, and purposefully absented from it. The Doctor had heard such an Objection from some of the dividing Party. Says he to Mr. *Nelson*, * *Others take upon you to say that the Consecrations of our Bishops, and the Power thereby conferred upon them by the Synod of the Deprived Fathers, was not valid for want of the Consent of Bishop Ken.* He first proves there was no need of that one particular Person, who might have been present if he pleased, and whose positive Dissent goes for nothing. But then the Doctor adds, "It is not true that the Consecrations of our Bishops wanted Bishop *Ken's* Consent, which he gave before in a Letter which he wrote on purpose to the Bishop of *Ely*, one of the Consecrators; and afterwards when he met one of the Consecrated, gave him his Congratulation in these or the like Words, that tho' he was not present in Person at his Consecration, yet he was present at it in Spirit: And since when some of our Communion told him they were afraid no Provision was made for the Church, he, to give them Satisfaction, assur'd them, that Provision was made by new Consecrations.

If all this be true, I am sure it is contrary to what the Writer of the Life of Bishop *Ken*, his Kinsman and Executor, assisted by his Chaplain Dr. *Thomas Cheyney*, has affirmed to us, † *That his*

C

Opinion

* A Collection of Papers of Dr. *George Hickes*, p. 226. A

† Life of Bishop *Ken*, p. 26.

Opinion was not agreeable to such of the Nonjurors, who were for continuing a Separation; by private Consecrations among themselves, may (should there be any good Occasion) best be known by his Answers to Letters, written from Men of Learning, who conversed with him on that Subject, and which he left behind him. And indeed had his Lordship any way countenanced such Consecrations, as Dr. Hickes confesses must be clandestine because they are treasonable by our Laws, he would have hardly told the Privy Council in the Beginning of 1696. “ * That he had
 “ gone into the Country to his Retirement in
 “ an obscure Village, where he lived above the
 “ Suspicion of giving any the least Umbrage to
 “ the Government.

But that which angered Dr. Hickes, was Bishop Ken's deserting of that Cause by a voluntary Resignation of his See. Says the Doctor, p. 227.
 “ The strange Humour of resigning took him. I
 “ say the *strange Humour*; First, Because it was not
 “ in his Power so much as to make a Cession
 “ without the Consent of his Collegues, much
 “ less without their Consent to resign to any particular Person; because by the Nature of the
 “ Episcopal College, as well as the Canons of
 “ the Church, they were to elect and admit into
 “ his vacant See. *Secondly*, Because he pretended
 “ to resign, to heal the Schism in his Diocess;
 “ a Reason, which if good, should have obliged
 “ him to have resigned at first, and not to have
 “ kept his Diocess Twelve Years or more in
 “ Schism. *Thirdly*, I think it a *strange Humour*,
 “ because he resigned, as much as in him lay, to
 “ one who neither could nor durst own himself
 “ for his next Successor, but is obliged to own
 himself

* Account of his Examination before the Privy Council, subscribed by his own Hand, April 28, 1696.

“ himself next Successor to the Intruder Dr. *Kid-*
 “ *der*; and also because he resigns to one with
 “ whom he does not communicate upon the ac-
 “ count of the immoral Prayers; whereby the
 “ Bishop to whom he resign’d effectually teaches
 “ the Flock which he resign’d to him, the dam-
 “ nable Doctrine of Resistance and Deposing So-
 “ vereign Princes, and leads them into a fatal Er-
 “ ror of taking Right for Wrong, and Wrong for
 “ Right. ” So that Bishop *Ken*, in the Opinion
 of his Brother *Hickes*, is not only a *Humourist*,
 but a Separatist, and a Promoter of Heresy and
 Rebellion.

Mr. *Kettlewell* was the third Man I mentioned,
 who has not met with kind Usage from his Bre-
 thren of the Separation with him. Mr. *Kettle-*
well was a very serious and austere Man, made
 for a Confessor and Sufferer in any Cause which
 he should think to be good. He refused the Oaths,
 and at last would not Communicate with those
 that took them. But he likewise falling short in the
 Perfection of Dr. *Hickes*’s Principles, he is marked
 out for a sort of *Heretical Pravity* in him, and stands
 stigmatized to be read with caution, like an un-
 catholick Writer in an expurgatory Index, * “ The
 “ Reader is desired to take Notice, that in the latter
 “ End of Mr. *Kettlewell*’s Christian Communion,
 “ the worthy Author, out of his extraordinary
 “ Mildness and good Nature, has made some Al-
 “ lowances which are not agreeable with the true
 “ Notion of Schism, or with the Principles of Church
 “ Communion, nor indeed consistent with the o-
 “ ther Part of his Book. — Therefore let every
 “ Reader of that Book take Care, that he be not

* A Note added after the Declaration and Profession of the
 Rev. Mr. *John Kettlewell*, March 23, 1694. before his Death,
 April 12, 1695. in the said Collection of Papers by Dr. *Hickes*.

“ at all biaſſed, either by M. Kettlemell’s Authority, or by any worldly Intereſt.”

I have too long detained your Lordſhip with theſe Paſſages of the Differences and Feuds among thoſe Fathers and Brethren, and of the cenſorious and bitter Spirit of Dr. *Hickes* in his Reflections on ſome of them ; intending, had I Time, to infer, that when they had ſeparated from us, they were as far from agreeing with one another, or ſpeaking charitably of one another. They loved to call themſelves *the Few*, and the *faithful Few* ; and yet were too many to come to any unity of Judgment or Affection ; they divided and ſubdivided in their own little Flock, even Paſtor againſt Paſtor : I queſtion whether Dr. *Hickes* had any one of his *Peculium* that could go in entirely to his whole Scheme of the Separation.

And indeed the Principles, my Lord, upon which they formed their Schiſm from the eſtabliſhed Church, were by no Means uniform and common ; but almoſt every one of the Builders laid his own diſtinct Foundation. Dr. *Hickes* at firſt upon the *Hereties* of Reſiſtance and the Depoſing Power brought in at the Revolution. Mr. *Kettlemell* upon the *new Oath*, and *new Allegiance* required upon the Settlement of the Crown. Mr. *Dodwell* upon the Invalidity of Lay Deprivation by Act of Parliament. Others upon the *Immorality* of the *publick Prayers* for the Powers in Being, whom they thought Uſurpers. And if I underſtood Biſhop *Ken* in a Converſation with his Lordſhip at Mr. *Cherry’s*, he put it chiefly upon what he call’d the *Sacrilege* of *taking away Episcopacy in Scotland* *. It was that Multiplicity

* And even Dr. *Hickes* urg’d it as one Argument, that the *Scottiſh Nation* were guilty of a moſt grievous Schiſm, not only againſt their own, but againſt the Catholick Church, &c. Collect. of Papers, p. 140.

tiplicity of Notions that made them vary in their Practice: They boasted of six or seven Deprived Bishops; and what if there were four or five such different Ways of Behaviour among them, as could not possibly proceed from the same Principle, or any concerted Measures? Archbishop *Sancroft* went farther toward the Revolution, and was more passive after it, than any of his Brethren. The Bishop of *Chichester*, Dr. *Lake*, upon his Death-Bed declared for the Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience, Aug. 27. 1689. but tho' under Suspension, and expecting Deprivation, he had not yet thought of a Separation; he communicated with them who had not then separated from our Congregations; some of them, I think, are living, and some have died in our Communion*. The Bishop of *Glocester*, Dr. *Frampton*, though deprived of his See, was many Years after possessed of a Parochial Cure, wherein if he did not officiate, he generally joined with the People, and when he cared no longer to hold the Living, he obtained it from her Majesty Queen *Anne*, for one whom he recommended to her; though the Grant, I believe, was afterwards revoked by the Courage of Bishop *Fowler*. A fourth of their Fathers took another Turn, the Bishop of *Bath and Wells*, Dr. *Ken*, who suffered the Schism during the Life of Bishop *Kidder*, and yet upon the Translation of Bishop *Hooper* resigned to him to heal the Schism. So as we can find but three at most of the seven who lived to be at Harmony with one another, † in pitching upon Dr. *Hickes*

* The Declaration of the Bishop of *Chichester* was read and subscribed by him in the Presence of Dr. *Green*, the Parish Minister; Dr. *Hickes*, Dean of *Worcester*; Mr. *Jenkin*, his Lordship's Chaplain; Mr. *Powel*, his Secretary; Mr. *Wilson*, his Amanuensis; who all communicated with him.

† The Publisher to the Reader of the Collection of Papers of Dr. *Hickes*.

as the first Person to be admitted into the Episcopal College; and he was accordingly consecrated by Dr. Turner, Dr. White, and Dr. Lloyd, the deprived Bishops of Ely, Peterborough, and Norwich.

Nay, as their Bishops, so their Clergy and their People were of very different Sentiments about what they were to do, or not do, toward continuing or ending their Separation. When the large Collection of Letters to and from Mr. Dodwell, once carefully preserved by Mr. Cherry, comes to publick View, that Distraction among them will appear to have been very grievous. Dr. Hickes's Letter to Mr. Nelson does sufficiently shew, that it was with them as with the Donatists and Novatians, and most other of the old Schismatics; they who first divided had soon a Subdivision made from them, and so were crumbling till they came to Nothing. I think one of the severest Books against Dr. Hickes, is that of the Character of a Primitive Bishop, written by one whom he then thought to be one of the Faithful, if not one of their separate Communion: I am not willing to transcribe the Character he there gives of Dr. Hickes, but I find he knew him perfectly well. Even the Doctor himself was not always of one Mind in those Matters: Before his Mock Consecration to Thetford, he thought there was no Necessity of any new Consecrations to preserve the Being of their Church; because upon the Death of the last deprived Bishops, there would be a Devolution of Power to the chief Presbyters, who might be a Principle of Unity, till they could hereafter get Bishops to them from some Foreign Church; or as he states his Opinion, with Reference to Ireland, "That upon Supposition all the
 " Protestant Bishops should die in a long Po-
 " pish Reign, it would be the Duty of the Irish
 " Protestant People to adhere to their faith-
 " ful Presbyters, who in such a Vacancy would be
 " their

“ their Spiritual Guides, Guardians, Fathers, Pastors, and Principles of Unity to them, till they could procure one or more Bishops, which would be their Duty by all Means and Endeavours, to do as soon as possibly they could.” * Others again would have had no new Consecrations in England, but would have adhered to the *Irish* Bishop of *Kilmore*, then deprived and resident in England. So Dr. *Hickes* acknowledges, “ Some of our few deserting Brethren then thought the Bishop of *Kilmore*, as a Catholick Bishop, qualify’d to keep up our Communion, and would not have left us if he would have taken the Pastoral Care of us, and been a Principle of Unity to us.” But it seems he would take no Care of them, and they, poor Man, took as little of him: He was reduced to great Wants before he died; he represented his Wants to the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*; he complain’d, that his Friends were not kind to him: His Grace sent him his Bounty from Time to Time, and he was very thankful for being so enabled to pay some Debts, and to lay in some Provisions.

How divided they were among themselves does farther appear, from † *A Letter written to the Reverend Dr. GEORGE HICKES, containing some Objections against his Letter to Mr. NELSON*, written by one of that Party, who wants to have several Things cleared up, has this and that Objection, would fain be better satisfied, &c. And, I suppose, the Answer there given would not pass without a great many more Queries upon it.

Some of them who own’d Resistance to be a *Herefie*, would not own the Validity of Lay Depri-
vations

* Dr. *Hickes*’s Letter to Mr. *Nelson* in the Collect. of Papers, p. 164.

† *Ibid*, p. 174.

vations to be a *Heresie*, because indeed it was *never* condemned by the ancient Church as a *HERESY* (a): One would think a good Reason to those who were reducing all Things to the exact Standard of the Primitive Church. Yet others maintained it for exprefs and fundamental *Heresie*; and a third Sort would bring it off with a Distinction, that it was not a *Speculative Heresie* contrary to the *Credenda* of Religion; but yet it was one of the *Practical Heresies*, as being contrary to the *Agenda* of Religion (b). Hence again, some were very fond of asserting that our Bishops now in Possession of all the Sees in England, are *Hereticks*, like as the *Donatists* and *Novatians*, were *Hereticks* as well as *Schismaticks* (c). But others were a little more moderate, and thought our Bishops, though in the Schism, were *not proved guilty of Heresy* (d). Some were more concerned for the *Doctrines*, than for the Schism; and said, the deprived Bishops would have *quitted their Personal Rights*, provided they could have secured the *Doctrines of Passive Obedience, and the Independency of the Church*. Others, or even the same Men, said afterwards, "No, the deprived Bishops could not have quitted their Personal Rights, till the *Intruders* had confessed themselves invalidly elected and consecrated into their Sees (e). Some were absolutely forbidding their People to come to our Churches, because of our *immoral Prayers*, as they called them, *i. e.* Prayers for King George

(a) See Collection of Papers, p. 283. I wonder that none of the Primitive Fathers condemned this Sort of Schismaticks by the Name of Hereticks, as well as Mr. Dodwell, p. 284.

(b) Ibid. p. 305.

(c) Ibid. p. 288.

(d) Page 292.

(e) We cannot but take the Revolution Church to be Heretical as well as Schismatical, Ib. p. 303.

George and his Royal Family. * Others thought they might *hear* those Prayers read, and yet not *join* in them, and the Duty of *joining* in the good Prayers, might oblige them to be *present* at those which were *not good*.

But I do confess, my Lord, that this last Pretension of People's coming to our Churches, and yet not joining in such a Part of the Prayers for the King and Prince, &c. but expressing a Dissent from them in the midst of the Congregation, is by no means consistent with the Sincerity of Christians, or with the Nature of joint and publick Worship: And whatever some of the *Jacobites* themselves may catch at to excuse and palliate a cowardly Practice of Rebellion in the Heart and Lips; yet we Clergy-men ought by no means to justify it, or willingly to bear with it. I think, as we are a National Christian Church, our Prayers for *them* who have the Supreme Authority in the Nation, are a Scriptural Canon to us, 1 Tim. 2. 12. for Kings and all that are in Authority. I think, if any Person had come into any Assembly of Christians in that Age of the Apostles, and refus'd to join in that part of the *Supplications and Prayers*, he would have been cast out as a Despiser of the *Dominions and Dignities* in Being: Or if he had quibbled and said, he could not pray for the Emperour, because he was an Ufurper, a Tyrant, or any other odious Name, should this Plea have cover'd his Dissent from the rest of the Congregation? Should he be allow'd to mean *one* Emperour, when the Minister following the Establishment meant and nam'd *another*? If there were Competitors for the Empire, were

D the

* Dr. George Hickes calls them Prayers execrable in their Nature, polluting Christian Offices, &c. in his Letter to Mr. Nelson, p. 176, 177, &c.

† The Answer to Dr. Hickes, p. 285.

the Christian Church of Bishops and Presbyters to decide the Titles of them? If one were a *Possessor*, and another a *Pretender* to Right, did any Christians espouse the latter, or concern themselves about him? Did not the Primitive Fathers boast of this Principle and Practise upon it, that they prayed for the Emperours upon the Throne, and were never called by the Name of any opposite Faction?

And therefore I can by no means approve of the Distinction of an *Intentional* and *Final* Imposition of a thing commanded: Any Command of lawful Authority, given by sufficient Declaration of it, is no longer an *Intentional* but a *Final* Imposition to all Intents and Purposes, till it is revok'd by the same Authority. It would be of the most pernicious Consequence to apply that Distinction to express Orders and publick Acts of Authority, that Subjects might wave their Obedience to them, till they saw whether their Governours would finally *insist* upon them, and whether they would really inflict the Penalties they had before threatned and *intended*. How shall we know that any Act of Parliament, or any Canon, is of any Force and Vertue upon the first promulging of it? How shall we have any Free-will Obedience, if it must be *finally* extorted? Must not Subjects think their Law-givers in earnest, till they feel the Terroures of the Law? I am hinting only for want of room to argue; but I presume some body will shew the Fallacy and the ill Consequences of this Distinction.

If your Lordship should ask, how then I would argue with those disaffected People, that come to our Publick Congregations, and yet shew an open Aversion to the Prayers for King George. I must needs say, I would not lend them a Distinction to palliate and prolong that Practice, which is in it self a Schism in the Church, and may be a greater Scandal

dal than a Separation *from* it. But I would labour to convince them, that in the first Churches planted by the Apostles of Christ, their stated Prayers for Kings, and All in Authority, were expressly injoin'd by Scripture, and were a Term of Communion in every Church: And had any private Christians then pleaded, that they could not in Conscience join in such Prayers and Supplications for this or that Chief Governour, because they questioned or denied his Title of Election, Succession, Adoption, or whatever was the common Title of Princes; and that their Words or Meaning should be in the midst of the Congregation to pray, differently from the Minister and People, for another Imperial Head, whom they thought to have a better Right against the Possessor: Such private Christians would not have been suffered in any Religious Assembly, but would have been thought guilty of breaking the Unity of the Spirit, and the Bond of Peace, in the Face of God and the Congregation.—I would prove to them, that the same Rule and Practice of one Mind and of one Voice, obtained in all the Primitive Churches, in their Publick Assemblies, they acknowledged the Civil Governours in Being, and pray'd for them; and if any Person then present had openly dissented from those Prayers, he would have been censured as a Schismatick and Divider of the Church.—I would tell them, that the same Catholick Conformity prevailed in this Church and Nation of *England*, from the Conquest to the Revolution, the Kings upon the Throne had the publick Suffrages of the Priest and People: And tho' Titles were continually disputed, and the Princes who recovered an older Right of Inheritance would call their Predecessors Kings *de facto*, not *de jure*; yet it was all one in the Prayers of the Church, no one Scruple that we read of, in Praying as required for the King in Being, whether they

D z

thought

thought him an Usurper, or whether they pleased to call him the Right Heir.—In short, I would shew it was so amongst the Papists themselves in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*, while they came to our Churches, for about the first ten Years of her Reign: They denied her Birth-right*, and most of them had their Eyes on a Pretender of their own Religion; and yet they joined, for ought we hear, in the Publick Prayers for the Queen, which were in most Parts of the Liturgy, as full and express as they now are for King *GEORGE*. And it was not on that Foot of suspending and refusing their Prayers for the Queen, that they soon after entirely separated from us.—I would proceed therefore to satisfy them, that the Question of Right and Title in a legal Settlement ought not to be the Matter of Dispute and Dissension in the Publick Prayers of the Church, especially among the People in following the Minister, and begging God's Blessing on the Powers that protect them.—Though, after all this arguing, I would undertake to prove to them, that our present Sovereign King *GEORGE* had really and effectually the Best Title that *English* King or Queen ever had: The nearest Proximity of Blood capable to defend a Protestant Church and Nation: The Call and Designation and repeated Acknowledgments of the whole Legislature in several successive Parliaments before his Accession to the Crown: His Wisdom, Justice, Clemency, and other Royal Vertues, that make him answer the End of all Government, the being a Minister of God for apparent common Good: And the singular

* Pope *Paul IV.* had told the *English* Embassadour Sir *Edward Kairn*, upon the Death of Queen *Mary*, that *Elizabeth* could not succeed, being Illegitimate. See Sir *R. Twisden's* *Vindication*, p. 126.

gular Providence of God in securing his Right and Possession against all his Enemies, and blessing him with a daily Increase of Interest and Honour, in the Eyes of his good People, and even in the Sight of all *Europe*.——But truly, my Lord, after I had said thus much, and what might occasionally offer upon these Hints, if they still adhered to their Prejudice, and would tell me that they could not in Conscience pray for King *GEORGE*, I would desire them to consider better; and if after some Consideration they should still persevere in it, I would desire them to stay at Home, rather than give a Publick Offence; and if notwithstanding they would come to my Church, and openly dissent from those Prayers, I would again admonish them, and upon their Contempt I would refuse to give the Holy Sacrament to them, till they were in more Charity with the Government, and with me and their Neighbours: And according to their following Behaviour, I would farther proceed with them.

There is another *Distinction* likewise framed, that is not so right in it self, nor will it convince the new Schismatics to whom it condescends; namely, the *wide Difference between the Schism of Co-ordination, and the Schism of Subordination*; and that Dr. *Compton*, the Bishop of *London's* Acknowledgment of Intruders into neighbouring Sees, was but a *Schism of Co-ordination* in respect to those his equal Collegues, and could not justify a *Schism of Subordination*, which must have followed, if the Clergy and People of *London* Diocess had thereupon separated from Bishop *Compton*, or his present Successor.

Now, my Lord, I do not think that Bishop *Compton* was guilty of any Manner of *Schism*, but if he were, he must be guilty of a *Schism of Subordination*, and not of *Co-ordination* only. No, says the
the

the Distinguisher, I need not observe to the Non-Jurors, that all Bishops are of the same Order and Dignity. Yes, but they tell us again, that tho' one Bishop is not subordinate to another *single* Bishop, yet he is still subordinate to the *College of Bishops* ; which true College were the deprived Bishops ; and that Bishop Compton broke that Unity and Order to which he ought to have been subject. Nay, and they tell us, that by our Constitution, which had prevailed likewise very early in the Primitive Church, Bishop Compton was in a *Provincial* Capacity as well as in a *Diocesan*, subordinate as a Suffragan to Archbishop Sancroft ; and that he broke through that *Subordination*, even by a breach of his Oath of Canonical Obedience to his Primate and Metropolitan ; and farther still by assisting and presiding in the Consecration of a new Archbishop, Usurper and Intruder, as they call him : Which certainly makes the Distinction in that Case to be put into the Mouths of the Jacobites, rather than to be taken from 'em. I have, my self, heard them complain of Bishop Compton as the Ring-leader of the Schism. †

And therefore Dr. *Hickes* is upon a consistent Hypothesis (were the Foundation of it true) that will by no Means admit of any such refined Distinction. He says plainly, and we can understand him, that “ the true Church Regent is the College of
 “ Bishops in *England*. And that as in every *Diocess*
 “ the Church is in the rightful Bishop, who is the
 “ Principle of Unity in it, and his Flock, though
 “ never so small in Number : So in every *Province*,
 “ the Episcopal College is in the rightful Primate
 “ or

† Collection of Papers, p. 103.

So the *Case of Schism*, p. 5. cries out, they not only displaced the Canonical Metropolitan Archbishop Sancroft, but hoisted up a Subject Presbyter of his, Dr. Tillotson, into his Room, who had sworn Canonical Obedience to him.

“ or President of it, and those Bishops and their
 “ Flocks who adhere to him as the Principle of
 “ Unity therein.” And he does abundantly im-
 ply, nay affirm, that Bishop *Compton*, by leaving
 his Primate and consecrating another into that
 Metropolitan See, was a Principal in the guilt of
 the *Schism of Subordination*. For, speaking of those
 who filled up the Sees of the deprived Bishops,
 says he, “ their Electors and Consecrators are *Auc-*
 “ *tores & Duces Schismatis*, Authors and Architects
 “ of the Schism, and in the same Degree of Guilt
 “ with them that are Breakers of the sacred Or-
 “ der of Co-ordination and SUBORDINA-
 “ TION.” * Again, in the *Answer* ordered
 by Dr. *Hickes*, “ None of the deprived Bishops Sees
 “ were really vacant, no Person was nominated
 “ to them by the KING (*i. e.* King *James*) nor
 “ were the Intruders consecrated by the Metro-
 “ politan (Archbishop *Sancroft*) but without, nay
 “ against his Consent, though he was still living,
 “ and their lawful Primate.” †

To do Dr. *Hickes* justice, as he is extremely Ri-
 gid in the utmost Bounds of an extravagant Cause,
 so he is uniform and steady in it ; and by what he
 writes, it is plain and evident what he means,
 which cannot be said of Mr. *Dodwell*, nor, I
 think, of any other of their Writers in that Con-
 troversie.

These things, my Lord, might be represented
 more at large, and I think if we must bring the
Argumenta ad Hominem, adapt our Arguments to the
 Prejudice of those People, by gracious Concessions
 to them (a way that seldom prevails) this would
 be a fair way of expostulating with them, Why
 they

* Collection of Papers, p. 97, 96,

† Ib. p. 314.

they keep up a Schism that their Leaders could not agree upon? And why do they boast of the Union of a true Church, when so many were the Windings and Turnings of the Guides in that way? Why must we suffer for the Spiritual Rights of those deprived Bishops, who after their Deprivation never exerted those Spiritual Rights? Why after those Bishops are dead and gone, must we adhere to their pretended Successors, when they dare not tell us how they became Successors to them? This honest way, if any thing, might serve to convince their Followers, that they can hardly be in a right way, since they know not whence they come, or whither they are going. They may, for a short Time, agree as a *Political Faction*; but as a *Spiritual Society*, they were at first, and must be ever in Confusion.

I beg your Lordship's Pardon, and fall back from this Digression, to return to the *MS* Letter found among the Papers of Mr. Howel. There is one other Passage that deserves some Notice in Justice to the World, and to the Memory of those Great Men, who encouraged Mr. Rymer to collect and publish those fifteen Volumes of *Publick Acts*, which (however deficient and short of the first Proposal) are the best Monument of the past Glories of a Nation, that ever yet appear'd since the Beginning of Nations. In my former to your Lordship, I had referred to the best Authorities as they stood there transcribed from the Records; and for this the Epistoler rebukes me in these Words; *I must take leave to tell you, that had you acted the part of a faithful Traditor, you ought to have looked into those Volumes of Records collected by Mr. Rymer, (I think eight or nine in Number,) but unprinted, (for what Reason any honest Man may guess that considers at what Time they were collected,) in which are contained the most material, relating to Church-Persons, and Affairs, and not to have* excerp'd

excep'd Citations from an adverse Party only, who were not likely to speak any thing in favour of a Loyal Subject in those Times of Murder and Rebellion.

My Blood was a little quick at this Paragraph. Surely, thought I, if the Writer could not spare the Times, nor the adverse Party, yet he might have spared Mr. Tho. Rymer, and not have made the honest Man such a Tool, as to pick out the Instruments that made for the present Civil Government to be publish'd, while he suppress'd the most material relating to the Interest of the Church and Clergy.

Your Lordship has had great Opportunities to know the Truth of that Matter; and I think you can better relate it to this effect, that in the happy and victorious Part of the Queen's Reign, some of the Prime Ministers, especially the Lords Somers and Halifax, assisted by the Bishops of Canterbury, Sarum, and Norwich, (nor was your Lordship wanting) did consult of a better way to preserve the Records in the Tower, did move it in the House of Peers, and had a standing Committee appointed for it, who from Time to Time came to several Resolutions for searching out and digesting the Original Rolls and Papers, for providing and framing a better Repository for them, for committing them to a safer Custody, and for securing an easier Access to them. It was under the Influences of this Publick Spirit, that it was thought it would be a Benefit and Credit to the Nation, to print and publish a Collection (in order of Time) of Authentick Copies of the Original Instruments, more especially relating to Peace and War, Treaties, Articles, and other Intercourse with Foreign States and Princes. Mr. Rymer, as Historiographer Royal, was appointed to collect them, and Mr. Churchill to print them, upon the Publick Account, and (which was Pity) in too small a Number of Copies, for Presents on-

ly and publick Respects, not for common Sale. Mr. Rymer was obliged to trust other Hands, not only in the transcribing, but in the selecting of Materials for them. When he came to review them in the single Sheets, he threw by several of them, as not so directly pertinent to the main Design. But whatever Papers were thus cast by, it was, I dare say, without any Instruction from the Ministers of State, and without any Political Views within himself; it was only to omit what did not so directly answer his professed Title of *Fœdera, Conventiones, Literæ, & cujuscunque generis Acta Publica inter Reges Angliæ & alios quosvis Imperatores, Reges, &c.* However the Copies thus omitted were not sunk or destroy'd, but committed to the Bookseller, in whose Hands they now remain (tho' not in eight or nine Volumes, as the Writer to me multiplies them in a Dream) and a Sight and Use of them was communicated to the late Lord Bishop of Sarum, toward compiling a *third Part of his History of the Reformation*, wherein he refers to these Manuscripts of Rymer. Many of those Papers did concern the Popes and Court of Rome, and the State of Ecclesiastical Affairs, in Complaints, Appeals, Delegations, Decrees, and a thousand Arts of creating Church Controversies, and prolonging the Dependence of them. These therefore, as Trumpery, were thrown by, as not tending to the great End of Leagues and Treaties; and, to save unnecessary Expences, were kept unprinted; not upon any View of the *Times*, or any *Trick* of an *adverse Party*, as that Writer has surmised with no Manner of Charity or Truth.

I appeal to your Lordship, that Mr. Rymer was so far from an artful Collector, that he was too Supine and Careless of what was done in that Work, and hardly deserved his Name to be ascribed to it. For though in his first Volume, 1704, he did
vouchsafe

vouchsafe to give the Reader some Account of what the old Historians had observed under the respective Years concurrent with the fuller Testimonies now given of them, * and did promise to be more large in his following *Tomes*: Yet in the very next he was content with an *English Dedication* to the Queen, without any such promised regard to the Reader, either in that or any other of the xv *Tomes*, published before his Death. Which makes the xvth *Tome*, published by Mr. *Sanderfon*, as valuable as any of the former. I am afraid Mr. *Rymer* did not always collate the Transcripts with the *Autographa*, or did not afterwards revise the Sheets from the Press; for your Lordship well knows there be many Escapes and Mistakes in the Print, especially in the Names of Persons and Places, obvious to most Men acquainted with the History of those Times.

One Suggestion, my Lord, may from hence arise, that since a Suspicion is raised of foul Practice in not printing all and singular the Copies transcribed for Mr. *Rymer*, it would well become the Spirit of the Present Ministry, to order all those omitted Papers to be put into one or two Supplemental *Volumes*; not only to vindicate their noble Predecessors, and to silence that late Clamour of unreasonable Men, but to enrich the Republick of Letters, and to gratifie the Lovers of Antiquity, the Friends of their King and Country.

There is, I confess, a better Method of saving that Trouble and Expence, but then it is by a much greater; and I will mention it, because I think no Attempt is too great for the Genius of the present Court, when Peace and Commerce

E 2 shall

* *Plurima hujusmodi ubilibet pullulantia vident curiosi Lector; sed quamplurima hujusmodi, & jam nunc debentia dici, in aliud tempus expectanda differimus.*

shall have their full Settlement. It is, my Lord, to give a new Edition of all those Collections in a less Bulk, by a smaller Letter and fewer Breaches, and throwing out some Duplicates: To insert the omitted Papers as they fall into the Series of Time; to add any other Copies of original Deeds and Evidences, of which there be Thousands still remaining of the like Importance; and then to collate and supervise with that Diligence and Accuracy that are due to the publick Faith and Honour. And I have another Wish at least, to employ one or two able Hands for the running along an *Historical Thread* with every Instrument, shewing the Occasion, Connexion, Dependence, with the chief Use and Application of them; namely, how such and such Errors in the common Historians may be well corrected, such Defects and Omissions supplied; such Contradictions reconciled; such Traditions condemned; such Pretensions confounded; and a new Light given for better Discoveries in the dark Places of every Age. Some such Improvement of the Work, by the Pains of an able Editor, and the Support of a bountiful Prince, may, I hope, come to be one of the growing Glories of this Reign. The rather because the Use of those Volumes is now found so necessary Abroad, for the transacting of our Publick Affairs, that His Majesty within His Dominions in *Germany*, had a late Occasion to enquire for them, and could not have been supplied with them at any Mart in *Europe*, nor indeed at any Place of Sale in *Great Britain*, had not the worthy Comptroller signified so much to a noble Peer in *England*, who by the next Return presented His Majesty with his own Set of them, curiously bound.

There is but one Objection against what I propose, and that is the Charge of it; an Objection too mean to be made by a Government that will ever think

think of that Charge. I remember a Story of the late Duke of *Buckingham*, who was projecting some extravagant Work at *Cleveland*, and advised about it with a Gentleman coming to visit him, Sir R. G. who, when he had heard the mighty Scheme and the Extent of it, answer'd, *This would be very glorious, my Lord Duke; I have but one Objection, it will cost a prodigious Sum of Money.* The Duke look'd upon him with great Contempt, and said — *Who would advise with such a narrow soul'd Fellow!*

This literary Project was not indeed thought of in a late Juncture, when they talk'd of *cultivating the Arts of Peace*. The Records of the Tower were then search'd, I doubt for a less honest Political Purpose. The two Persons, or their Undertakers, who had the easiest Access to the Rolls, to the Paper Office, and to the Libraries of Publick Ministers, were the two Authors of *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, chiefly of England*, in two Volumes, Fol. and *Of the Hereditary Right of the Crown of England asserted, by a Gentleman*, Fol *. The two Performances, that I think of all others were calculated to soften Popery, and bring in Tyranny of Church and Crown; and are therefore managed in a Way suitable to those Designs, with the utmost Air of Authority, and yet with the utmost Prejudice and Party-Study; as in my former Letter I gave your Lordship a little Specimen, and shall confirm it by abundant Proofs, when I come to give a Supplement to the Life and Death of Bishop *Merk*, which for Truth and Justice sake I shall do at the next Opportunity.

The most accurate Writers in History may have their Mis-information and Mistakes upon it; and the Apology then is, that they had some Authority

ty for what is said ; and that they fairly reported, without Respect of Persons, or contending Parties. But when Men engage in a particular Cause of Self-Interest, or Humour, and set themselves against the Generality of Mankind, and then pick up Stories that may serve their own Side, and expose what they call the adverse Party : This is a Violence to be abhorr'd in a free Nation.

I have already intimated, my Lord, that it is above all for this Reason I utterly dislike the late *Collection of Papers written by Dr. George Hickes*. I am shock'd at his distorted Use of Holy Scriptures, his fanciful Inventions about the Nature and State of the first Evangelical Churches ; his insisting absolutely on the Testimonies of Fathers in Matters of Discipline and outward Practice, wherein they must needs run backward and forward, as the Course of Times and Constitution of Countries might require ; his exalted Notions of the *Kingdom of the Church*, the *Thrones of Royal Priests, Vicegerents of the eternal Melchisedeck, Spiritual Principalities*, and other assumed Titles of Sovereignty, beyond Popery, beyond any Enthusiasm but that of the *fifth Monarchy Men*, who were setting up King *Jesus* upon Earth ; his arraigning our whole Constitution, Ecclesiastical and Civil, as upon a wrong Bottom from the very first Foundations of it, upon many false Maxims extremely hurtful to the Church, and detrimental to the Christian Religion, received for Law and Truth* ; as, “ that Tythes and Offerings may become a Lay Fee ; that Patronage, or the Right of presenting Clerks to Cures, is a Lay Fee ; “ that the King is Supreme Ordinary ;— and particularly, the Unchristian Acts of Parliament touching the Election and Consecration of “ Bishops,

* *Collection of Papers, p. 74, &c.*

“ Bishops, and the like, which he is able to shew
 “ have been the *Natural*, as well as *Judicial*, Causes
 “ of all the Miseries in Church and State among
 “ us for many Years†. His Painting our Reforma-
 tion blacker than *Sanders* and the *Jesuits* could e-
 ver represent it, and making a Separation or Schism
 from it necessary upon those Principles, as much
 at the Beginning of *Queen Elizabeth*, as at the Be-
 ginning of *King William*. His Modelling such an
 Independent Church, and yet making the Christi-
 an Magistrate so much depending on it, that no
 Christian Prince or State would protect such a
 Church; or if they did, they must be in a worse
 Condition, as to Temporals, than the Heathen
 Emperours were, in and after the Apostles Time.
 His bringing the Clergy of our Church into the
 utmost Contempt and Incapacity; they can per-
 form no valid Acts of Priesthood, their very Prayers are
 Sin, their Sacraments are no Sacraments, their Absolu-
 tions are null and of no force, God ratifies nothing in Hea-
 ven which they do in his Name upon Earth, they and all
 that adhere to them are out of the Church, they can claim
 no Benefits of God's Promises; no, not of his assisting
 Grace, nor of Remission of Sins through the Merits of
 Christ's Blood. Nay, though they should dye Martyrs in
 the Schism, their Martyrdom would not be accepted; if
 they could dye Martyrs more than once, they could not
 make amends for their Sin with their Blood*. We have
 seen, my Lord, many terrible Forms of solemn
 Cursing in the Church of Rome, but never any
 Thunder like this, never any striking so deep to the
 Pit of Hell. His shewing many other Instances of
 his Good-Will to us of the inferiour Clergy; one
 Instance especially that we cannot approve, his
 shutting

† Ib. p. 28, 29. 83. 146. 314.

* Collection of Papers, p. 32, 33. and in many other Places.

shutting us all out of the Convocation-House; for we have forgot, it seems, what a perfect Synod is, which is a Synod of the Provincial Bishops, on the Majority of them under the Metropolitan, in which he is personally, or by Proxy present. Such a Synod only †. So that we have been disputing about the Privileges of our House to a fair Purpose, when, as soon as the Church was out of Danger, we were all to be turned out of Doors. He has a great many other Positions and Consequences, that all the Lovers of Truth and Charity must think to be absurd and dreadful. But I say at present, my Lord, I had more Mind to take Notice of his Licentiousness in Matters of Fact, and his Story Relations so bitterly delivered and applied, that there is no Belief of them.

He has given some Instances of his dealing with his old Friends, when they did but in the least disoblige him; what were his Enemies to expect? Let me point at one Instance that will not long detain your Lordship; it lies within the Compass of one half Page 235, the loading of six or seven particular Persons with a great deal of Reproach, among them an Archbishop, two Bishops, besides the Body of the London Clergy; and all this in three little Stories, that I dare say are none of them ingenuous and true.

Speaking of a sinful Latitude and Comprehension, by which we leave the People to believe and profess what they please, provided they will help to fill our Churches, and make a Shew and Appearance of Communion, he tells his Tales, " Thus
" Mr. Firmin, that notorious *Arian* and *Macedonian*,
" was a great Favourite of the Bishop and Clergy
" of London, but more especially of Dr. Tillotson, and
" was allowed, while he lived, to come to Church
" and

† Collection of Papers, p. 226. So before, p. 103. the true Church Regent is the College of Bishops in England &c.

“ and sit down at the *Gloria Patri*, to testify his
 “ Dissent to the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as
 “ you intend to stand up at the immoral Prayers,
 “ to testify your Dissent to them. Thus Mr. *Baxter*
 “ was allowed to come not only to Church, but
 “ to the Altar : And thus Bishop *Lloyd*, then Bishop
 “ of St. *Asaph*, administered the Holy Eucharist to
 “ Dr. *Bates* sitting in a Pew, at the Time of the
 “ Revolution *.

Now I doubt every one of these Stories is somewhat like a Popish Legend, whatever Truth it first had in the Original Occasion of it, yet that little Truth is so blended, vampt up, and wrought upon, that it is all a new thing. As to Mr. *Firmin*, I think he should not be call'd a notorious *Arian* and *Macedonian* : He did not borrow his Heresies from any of the old Heresiarchs, nor did he search back into antient Writings. He was Pupil indeed to a sort of *Macedonian* (yet more than he knew) Mr. *John Biddle*, and waited upon *Cromwell* to get his Release from *Newgate*, and used often to tell of the Repri- mand he met with from his Highness. However, I think Mr. *Firmin* took his Notions rather from the Modern *Socinian* Writers, and if he delighted in any Name it was in that of *Unitarian*. Whatever he was, he was not a Favourite of the Bishop and Clergy of *London*, nor of Dr. *Tillotson*, upon any account of Doctrine or Tenet ; but merely as he was an active and publick-spirited Man, a very useful Citizen, of great Acquaintance and Interest, and very much intrusted with the receiving and disposing of Money for pious and charitable Uses ; and for these good Works he would have been a greater Favourite with the Bishops and Clergy, if he had not been tainted with singular Opinions ; for

F

which

* Collection of Papers, p. 235.

which Dr. Tillotson, in his meek way, would often reprove him. How therefore can Dr. Hickes say, He was ALLOWED to come to Church and sit down at the *Gloria Patri*? Was there any professed, or so much as intimated Allowance given by any manner of Authority, down from the Bishop to the Church-Warden? Nay, I dare say Mr. Firmin did not allow himself in any constant visible Practice of it: For I have heard he came seldom or never to the Prayers of the Church; he came only to hear Sermons, and at the end of them he would commonly go out before the Blessing, rather than stay to shew any open Dissent from it, as given in the Name of the Holy Trinity.

Then as to Mr. Baxter, why so much Stress upon his being ALLOWED to come not only to Church, but to the Altar. By the Altar, I suppose, he means the Communion, not the Table; and that he received as other Lay Communicants did, kneeling and submitting to the publick Form and Manner in the Church of England: Which I think was no Reproach to him or to the Church. Such Charity of Communion, even of Occasional Communion, if it be of Catholick Love, not for Secular Ends, will soonest tend to the healing of our unhappy Divisions.

The last Story is more partial than the other two: That Bishop Lloyd, then Bishop of St. Asaph, should administer the Holy Eucharist to Dr. Bates SITTING in a PEW, was very needless when Dr. Bates made no Scruple of *Kneeling* (while possibly able to kneel) whenever he was (as very often) a Communicant in any of our Parish Churches. And it was improbable to be sitting in a PEW, because (as I have heard) Bishop Lloyd was the very Man who had reform'd that Custom of administering within *Pews* in his Church, and brought all his People to draw near to the Communion-Table.

Table. In Truth, Bishop *Lloyd*, while Minister of *St. Martins*, was not a Man given to break Rules and Orders of the Church, as some higher Folks have been more apt to do; he was rather so strict, that Mr. *Baxter* and his Friends complained of him as a hard Man. But why this to be at the Time of the *Revolution*? Bishop *Lloyd* was not Minister of *St. Martins*, or of any Church in or near *London* at that Time, nor for some Years before. It is well known, that as Dr. *Bates* went in the Mornings to his own Parish Church of *Hackney*, while there residing; so when he was in *London*, he went usually to Dr. *Beveridge*'s Church, and communicated there; and your Lordship will say, that of all City Divines Dr. *Beveridge* was the least likely to abate of any stated Rite and Ceremony. What must be the Men that in their Anger can tell such Stories? And what must be the Cause that requires them?

I have but one Observation more to make to your Lordship, which is, that in other Schisms and Divisions we might hope for some end of them, without a Necessity of submitting to such Conditions as *that* of Unchurching the Establish'd Church of *England*, and *that* likewise of transferring the Crown to another Head and Family: But these two are the express Conditions, the very Preliminaries insisted on by these Jacobite Schismatics, before they can treat with us; we must agree with them in the first place to the turning out all our Archbishops and Bishops, and if they could hope to be restored, it must be *effectually done when Time serves, by their desiring or accepting from the Crown new Nominations to their Bishopricks, * i. e. from the Crown* when placed on what they think the Right Head.

F 2

And

* Collect. of Papers, p. 278.

And yet not to have those new Nominations, till they have condemned the Doctrines of Resistance and Lay Deprivation; and likewise shall confess themselves to have been guilty of Schism, and have done something to testify their Repentance *. We must also agree to the dethroning of the best of Princes. Dr. Hicke is full enough of his Acknowledgments of another King, and that he was himself made a Bishop by some other King's Consent; the Consent of him who desired the Continuance of that Church of England which was in Communion with them †. And therefore rather than pray for his present Majesty King George, he would be of his other King's Religion. He should think it less heinous to be present at Divine Offices where Ave Maria's, &c. are said *. Nay, for his own Part, he had rather as a Priest, say Prayers in a Congregation to Saints and Angels, which is only forbid by a Positive Law, than these Prayers, by which (says he) My KING is abused, abjured, cursed, and the righteous King of Kings most horribly blasphem'd.

Good God! But see, my Lord, this Schism is nothing but a Political Faction arising out of the deadly Feud, an Abhorrence of the Revolution, and the Protestant Succession, and King George upon the Throne of His Ancestors. They are a spiritual Army for the Pretender, to take up carnal Weapons when they can. I lament their Misfortune, and would do any Thing honest for their Reconciliation. But this I take for granted, that we can never possibly reconcile them to our Church, till we have reconciled them to King GEORGE and his Protestant Royal Family.

How

* Collect. of Prayers, p. 292.

† Ibid. p. 171.

* Ibid. p. 8.

How far your Lordships in the next Session may attempt to reconcile them, is a Thing belonging to the Wife, I offer not to meddle with it. But this I remember, that *Schisms* in the Church have been effectually cured by the State ; especially the setting up one Episcopal Chair against another, though done by the Pretenders to Infallibility on both Sides, has been roundly determined by the Supreme Civil Powers in this Nation, who have thought it sufficient to declare to the Clergy and People, which Side was right, and which was wrong ; what Pope or Spiritual Father to be received as natural and true, and what to be disclaim'd as an Anti-Pope and Schismatical Pretender. This Authority over the highest Ecclesiastical Persons in a Cause of the most Canonical and Spiritual kind, was (as often as Occasion served) claimed and exerted by the Civil Sovereignty, within this Kingdom, no Matter whether by the King alone, or by the King and his Supreme Council. I cannot forget, that in a late Popish Reign, the Advocates for Regal Supremacy and a dispensing Power in the Crown, could then tell us, * “ that King *William I.* asserted this Usage of his Ancestors, that “ none in his Dominions should own the Pope, “ but by his Command. And that therefore it “ was not strange, that during the Schism between the Popes *Urban* and *Clement*, *William Rufus* claimed, as other Princes did, a Right to “ declare to which Pope he and his Kingdom “ would adhere. That Writer might have added, that it was so in the Reign of *Henry II.* and again, in the Reigns of King *Richard II.* and *Henry IV.* and *Henry V.*

But

* The King's Visitat. Power asserted by Dr. *Nathaniel Johnson*, 1688, 4^{to}. p. 145, 146,

But hoping to write again shortly before your Lordship leaves the North, I commit this to your Pleasure, and commend my self to your Blessing and Prayers.

Your Lordship's

Most faithful humble Servant,

Octob. 11. 1711.

White Kennett.

But